

**REMARKS**

Applicant herewith files a Request for Continued Examination along with the present Amendments in response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed August 5, 2003, and Advisory Action dated December 4, 2003, in the above-identified application.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 15 and 16 are amended, claim 5 is canceled and claim 17 is added. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

**RESPONSE TO §102 REJECTION**

In the final Office Action, claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by French Patent No. 2,774,149 (hereafter the '149 patent). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

In the Office Action and the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that "the '149 patent discloses a first sector 225 being adapted to generate images situated below the upper of the two half planes delimiting a cut-off." Accordingly, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 15 and 16 to further distinguish the present invention over the '149 patent. Specifically, claims 1, 15 and 16 have been amended to more particularly point out that the "first sector is *dedicated to generating* images situated below the upper of the two half planes delimiting a cut-off."

More specifically, the present invention as recited in claims 1, 15 and 16, is directed a headlamp for generating low beams which comply with U.S. regulations. This means that the cut-off line of the low beam is constituted by two half planes, which are horizontal and at

different heights, therefore, improving the repartition of light at the limit of the cut-off notably just below the superior half plane. This is achieved by modifying the reflector so that it presents a sector specifically dedicated to bring more light at the limit of the upper of the two half planes. Specifically, a sector 40, obtained by rotation, brings back under the upper half plane some images from the light source that would otherwise have been above the cut-off. The light added at the limit of the upper half plane is not "taken away" from another zone below the cut-off, and does not modify the light repartition elsewhere below the cut-off. Additionally, the reflector is only very locally modified.

In Fig. 1, the segmentation of the reflector is such that: 1) only one sector (40) makes for the upper part of the cut-off line (P2), which is capable of generating images in the zone (54) separating the upper part of the cutting line (P2) from the lower part of the cutting line (P1); and 2) all the other sectors make images below the lower part of the cut off line (P1, hh), which send images anywhere below the plane (hh). It is difficult to create a cut off-line for low beams without any shield or screen at the vicinity of the lamp.

In the present invention this is achieved by first choosing a transversal configuration of the lamp, and second dedicating one sector of the reflector for the upper part of the cut-off line (P2) and all the other sectors for the lower part of the cut off line (P1). This makes it possible to get a clear cut-off line according to U.S. regulations.

Conversely, the '149 patent deals with European low with a different cut-off line profile. It recommends using optical correcting means to get the appropriate cut-off line. Fig. 7 shows that sectors 214 and 226 of the reflector are used to generate images of the lamp filament which are slanted according to the 15° oblique part of the European cut-off line, whereas sectors 215 and 225 are used to generate images which are all horizontal so as to

make for the horizontal part of the cut-off line. The cut-off line is constituted by two half planes: 1) one being horizontal; and 2) one making an angle of 15° with the horizontal plane (page 7, lines 20-23 and Figures 10 and 23). The headlamp of FR '149 includes a mirror with at least one region (Z) for generating images of the light source. The region (Z) is inclined so that it varies the images in a limited interval with respect to the horizontal. (See Abstract). Therefore, according to the '149, there are several sectors of the reflector for each part of the cut-off line, e.g. for the horizontal part and for the oblique one. This goes against the invention's teaching. Additionally, as seen in Figs. 10 and 13, the images are not delimited so that they are situated between the horizontal line (H-h) and the cut-off line, as in the present invention. Moreover, there is neither description nor suggestion of a dedicated sector 40, as in the present invention.

Accordingly, claims 1, 15, and 16 are distinguishable over the '149 patent at least for the reasons noted above. Likewise, claims 3-6, and 8-14 are also believed to be distinguishable over the '149 patent because of their dependency from claim 1.

New claim 17 is also believed to be distinguishable over the '149 patent at least for the reasons noted above.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and are now in condition for allowance.